

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated April 2, 2008, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on July 2, 2008. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-42 are pending in the application. Claims 1-12 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 1 and 3-7 have been amended. Claims 13-42 have been cancelled. Applicant submits that the amendments and new claims do not introduce new matter.

Further, Applicant is not conceding in this application that those amended (or canceled) claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the claimed subject matter. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue these (pre-amended or canceled claims) and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

Interview Summary

On July 1st, 2008, a telephonic interview was held between Sanjay Shenoy, Applicant's Attorney, and Examiner Midys Rojas. The parties discussed the cited references including *Dean*. Claim 1 was discussed. The parties also discussed proposed amendments to claim 1. The proposed amendments are reflected in this response.

During the interview, the parties agreed that the proposed amendments would overcome the reference *Dean*. However, the Examiner stated that a further search would be required. Accordingly, the Examiner requested that a written response including the proposed amendments be filed for further consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Dean et al.* (6,604,174).

As stated in the Interview Summary section above, the parties have agreed that the amendments made herein overcome the reference *Dean*. Specifically, regarding claim 1 and claims depending therefrom, *Dean* does not disclose the a latency to access the allocated lines of the first private cache by the second processor is greater than a latency to access cache lines of a second private cache associated with the second processor. Furthermore, regarding claim 5 and the claims depending therefrom, *Dean* does not disclose that a latency to access the cache line of the second private cache by the first processor is greater than a latency to access cache lines of the first private cache associated with the first processor.

Therefore, the claims are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/

Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)